

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the clearly stated action and for conducting a telephone interview on June 14, 2010. This communication is filed in response to the Office Action having a mailing date of April 23, 2010, and is reflective of the discussion during the telephone interview. Twenty-nine (29) claims, including eight (8) independent claims, were paid for in the application. Claims 22, 51, 53-55, 57, 59, 60, 62-64 and 66 are currently amended to more distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants consider as their invention and to correct typographical errors. Claims 52 and 61 are canceled. No new matter has been added to the application, and all claims are believed in condition for allowance. No fee for additional claims is due by way of this Amendment. The Director is authorized to charge additional fees due by way of this Amendment only, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 19-1090. Upon entry of the amendments herewith, claims 22, 51, 53-60 and 62-67 remain pending.

Applicants have amended Claims 22, 51, 53-55, 59, 60 and 62-64 to more distinctly claim the subject matter that applicants consider as their invention. Claims 57 and 66 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. Entry of these amendments is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 22, 52, 59 and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fleck et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2001/0006383). Claims 51 and 60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck et al. in view of Oda et al. (US Patent No. 7,423,629). Claims 53 and 62 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck et al. in view of Fukuzaki et al. (US Patent No. 5,600,105), further in view of Ronkka et al. (US Patent No. 6,002,387). Claims 54, 55, 63, and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck et al. in view of Yamanami et al. (US Patent No. 5,028,745). Finally, Claims 56-58 and 65-67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fleck et al. in view of Fukuzaki et al. (US Patent No. 5,600,105).

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the finality of the previous Office Action. In response to applicants' arguments, however, the Examiner maintained that Fleck et

al. “does in fact teach the resonant power transmission coil” and “that this reference does read on the claim language.” (Office Action, page 12, paragraph 12.) Specifically, the Examiner has indicated that Fleck et al. teaches “a surface (51) including a position resolving grid (67) (see paragraphs 62 and 65), and a transducer (61)..., wherein the surface further includes a power transmission coil (67), which is distinct from the position resolving grid, for radiating the electromagnetic field, the power transmission coil being a resonant power transmission coil and consisting of a plurality of overlapping coils (see paragraph 65 and Figure 12).” (Office Action, pages 2-3, paragraph 4.)

Applicants agree that Fleck et al. describes the use of a transducer stylus including a resonant circuit (i.e., a tuning circuit) (see paragraph 67, Figure 13). However, Fleck et al. does not teach or suggest the use of a “surface [different from the transducer stylus]” that includes “a plurality of power transmission coils [for radiating the electromagnetic field to the transducer] being overlapping resonant power transmission coils” as recited in amended Claims 22 and 59. In the Office Action, the Examiner seems to suggest that “a surface (51)” of Fleck et al. corresponds to the “surface” recited in Claims 22 and 59 of the present application. However, in Fleck et al., the surface (51) is a touchpad provided on a stylus 44 for a user to place his finger on to thereby control “the image being written/drawn.” (See Figures 8-11C, showing the stylus 44 including the surface 51, and paragraph 56.) Thus, Figure 11C and paragraph 62 of Fleck et al. describe “a touchpad 51” that is provided on the stylus 44 including a resonant circuit. However, Fleck et al. does not teach or suggest that its overlapping conductive loop coils 67 on the tablet (surface) are resonant power transmission coils (see Figure 12, paragraph 65). Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Fleck et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every element of Claims 22 and 59, in particular, a “surface [different from the transducer, which is separately claimed] including a plurality of power transmission coils [for radiating the electromagnetic field to the transducer] being overlapping resonant power transmission coils.”

Claims 22 and 59, as amended, further recite that “the position resolving grid and the plurality of overlapping resonant power transmission coils are arranged coextensively on top of one another to form the surface,” similar to previous dependent Claims 52 and 61, now canceled. Regarding Claims 52 and 61, which depended from Claims 22 and 59, respectively, the

Examiner has found that Fleck et al. “further teaches that the position resolving grid and the resonant power transmission coil, consisting of a plurality of overlapping coils, are arranged on top of one another to form the surface (see paragraph 65 and Figure 12).” (Office Action, pages 3-4.) In this regard, Fleck et al. describes that “the same tablet coils both transmit and detect waves” but that “in other embodiments, the tuning circuit may send back waves to *a different set of loop coils in the tablet* than the coil(s) which sent energizing waves to the tuning circuit.” (Paragraph 65, Figure 12.) The quoted language of Fleck et al. indicates that two different sets of loop coils may be used, with one for transmitting and one for receiving. The language, however, does not teach or suggest that the two different sets “are arranged coextensively on top of one another” to form the surface, as recited in Claims 22 and 59.

Based on the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that Claims 22 and 59 are allowable over the prior art of record including Fleck et al. Claims 51, 53-58, 60 and 62-67 are all dependent from either Claims 22 or 59 and, therefore, these dependent claims are further believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons why Claims 22 and 59 are allowable. Favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SEED Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC

/Shoko Leek/

Shoko I. Leek

Registration No. 43,746

SIL:jrh

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 5400  
Seattle, Washington 98104  
Phone: (206) 622-4900  
Fax: (206) 682-6031  
1611565\_1.DOC